

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05727 211741Z

53

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /083 W

----- 068970

O R 211633Z OCT 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 4151

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T USNATO 5727

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR

SUBJ: MBFR: OPTION III: EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS: SPC MEETING

OCTOBER 20

REFS: A) STATE 248364 180119Z OCT 75; B) BONN 17182 201920Z OCT 75

C) USNATO 5146 192035Z SEP 75

1. THIS MESSAGE REPORTS ON EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS ASPECTS OF SPC
CONSIDERATION OF OPTION III OCTOBER 20. OTHER ASPECTS OF THE
MEETING REPORTED SEPTEL.

2. USREP (MOORE) INTRODUCED THE US COMPROMISE PROPOSAL FOR PARA 5
OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, ON EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS, PER PARA 3, REF A.
HE SAID THAT THE US HAD RE-EXAMINED ITS POSITION. THE US
COULD NOT ACCEPT MOVING PARA 10 INTO PARA 5, SINCE THIS WOULD
RESULT IN PREMATURE DISCUSSION OF CEILINGS ISSUES, WITH THESE
ISSUES, RATHER THAN THE MAIN OPTION III PORPOSAL, BECOMING THE
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05727 211741Z

FOCUS OF EASTERN ATTENTION. IT WAS NECESSARY TO TRY TO FORCE
THE EAST TO RESPOND TO THE MAIN ALLIED PROPOSAL BEFORE GETTING
INTO THESE CEILINGS ISSUES. HOWEVER, US SOUGHT TO TAKE INTO
CONSIDERATION ALLIED CONCERNS ABOUT PARA 5 BY ITS COMPROMISE

PROPOSAL.

3. CANADIAN REP (BARTLEMAN) WELCOMED THE US PROPOSAL, WHICH NOW PRESENTED A PLAUSIBLE EXPLANATION TO THE OTHER SIDE AS TO WHY THE ALLIES WISHED TO DEFER A DISCUSSION OF EQUIPMENT CEILINGS. HE HOPED THE US PROPOSAL WOULD PROVIDE A MEANS OF RESOLVING THE PROBLEM. NETHERLANDS REP (BUWALDA) SAID HE WISHED TO ECHO THE CANADIAN REMARKS. THE US HAD TAKEN A BIG STEP TOWARD MEETING THE CONCERN OF THE ALLIES, AND THE US PROPOSAL WOULD PROBABLY BE ACCEPTABLE TO THE NETHERLANDS.

4. BELGIAN REP (WILLOT) SAID HE APPRECIATED THE US PROPOSAL, BUT THIS WAS NOT YET THE SOLUTION. FIRST, THE US PROPOSAL TELLS THE EAST THE ALLIES WILL NOT GO INTO CEILINGS ISSUES UNTIL AN INDICATION OF EASTERN WILLINGNESS TO CONSIDER POSITIVELY "THE BASIC ELEMENTS OF THE WESTERN PROPOSAL". THIS LATTER PHRASE DIFFERED FROM THE PHRASE IN PARA 6 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE ("THE BASIC ELEMENTS AS CONTAINED IN PARA 1"), WHICH SPC HAD AGREED TO WITH SOME DIFFICULTY. SECOND, THE ARGUMENT IN THE US WORDING - THAT THE ISSUE OF ARMAMENT LIMITATION IS HIGHLY COMPLEX AND COULD SIDETRACK THE NEGOTIATION - COULD BE USED BY THE EAST TO DEMAND A DISCUSSION OF ARMAMENT LIMITATION PRIOR TO THE GIVING OF AN INSTRUCTED EASTERN RESPONSE ON THE MAIN OPTION III PROPOSAL. THIRD, THE FINAL SENTENCE IN THE US PROPOSAL DOES NOT SHUT THE DOOR ON LIMITATIONS ON NON-US ALLIED EQUIPMENT, AND COULD STILL LEAVE THE EAST THE IMPRESSION THAT THE ALLIES WERE WILLING LATER TO CONSIDER SUCH LIMITATIONS.

5. US REP REPLIED, RE THE FIRST POINT OF THE BELGIAN REP, THAT THE ALLIES NEEDED TO SAY "THE BASIC ELEMENTS OF THE WESTERN PROPOSAL", IN ORDER TO

AVOID REFERENCE TO PARAGRAPH NUMBERS IN THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, AS IN THE REFERENCE IN PARA 6 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE TO
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05727 211741Z

"THE BASIC ELEMENTS AS CONTAINED IN PARAGRAPH 1". THIS DID NOT CHANGE ALLIED AGREEMENT ON THE LATTER PHRASE. US REP QUESTIONED THE SECOND BELGIAN POINT, AND THE REACTION IT ANTICIPATED FROM THE EAST. HE AGAIN REVIEWED THE RASON BEHIND THE US APPROACH, IN RESPONSE TO THE THIRD BELGIAN POINT.

6. UK REP (BAILES) NOTED THAT AT A PREVIOUS MEETING THE ITALIAN REP HAD SUGGESTED DROPPING "IN PRACTICE" FROM THE FINAL BRACKETED PHRASE IN PARA 10, RE MANPOWER LIMITATIONS. UK ACCEPTED THAT SUGGESTION. BELGIAN REP OPPOSED IT.

7. FRG REP (HOYNCK) AND UK REP REMAINED SILENT DURING THIS DISCUSSION EXCEPT FOR UK INTERVENTION IN PRECEDING PARAGRAPH. UK REP HAD REACTED FAVORABLY TO THE US PROPOSAL FOR PARA 5 WHEN WE TOLD HER ABOUT IT EARLIER IN THE DAY, AND SHE THOUGHT THERE WAS A GOOD CHANCE LONDON WOULD ACCEPT IT. FRG REP THOUGHT IT WOULD HELP.

8. THERE WAS NO DISCUSSION AT THIS MEETING ON HAVING A SEPARATE TACTICS PAPER. FRG REP EARLIER IN THE DAY TOLD US HE WAS UNDER INSTRUCTIONS TO SUGEST AT THIS MEETING THAT THE UK DO A TACTICS PAPER. WE TOLD HIM WHAT UK HAD IN

MIND RE FURTHER WORK ON TACTICS ISSUES, I.E. FALL-BACK GUIDANCE ON WHAT THE AHG COULD SAY TO THE OTHER SIDE EARLY IN THE DISCUSSION ABOUT CEILINGS ISSUES IF THE OTHER SIDE REQUIRES THIS AS A CONDITION OF GIVING AN INSTRUCTED RESPONSE ON OPTION III. FRG REP WAS CERTAIN THAT BONN WOULD OPPOSE SUCH AN IDEA. HE DID NOT PROPOSE AT THE MEETING THAT THE UK DO A TACTICS PAPER. WE CHECKED WITH UK REP ON CURRENT UK THINKING ON TACTICS PAPER, AND SHE SAID LONDON APPEARS PREPARED TO WORK WITH THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, RATHER THAN ASKING FOR A SEPARATE PAPER. SHE INDICATED THAT LONDON WAS RE- CONSIDERING ITS IDEA OF CONTINGENCY GUIDANCE ON TACTICS, AND MIGHT NOT PROPOSE ANYTHING.

9. THERE WAS NO DISCUSSION OF APPROPRIATE DEFINITION OF THE SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 05727 211741Z

COMMON CEILING AT THIS MEETING. WE TOLD UK REP PRIVATELY THAT WE HAD DECIDED TO WAIT UNTIL THE THURSDAY MEETING TO INTRODUCE THE US COMPROMISE PROPOSAL, AND SHE WELCOMED THIS, SINCE SHE MIGHT BE ABLE TO MAKE AN INITIAL POSITIVE RESPONSE BY THAT TIME.

10. RE THE QUESTION OF WHETHER US OR FRG WILL INTRODUCE THE BILATERAL TEXTS FOR PARA 3 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE AND PARA 3 (BIS) OF THE DRAFT POSITION PAPER, WE NOTE THAT FRG HAS REAFFIRMED ITS WISH THAT THE US INTRODUCE THESE TEXTS (PARA 5, REF B). FRG REP HAS TOLD US THAT BONN HAS NOW INFORMED HIM OF ITS PREFERENCE. HE SAID THAT IT WOULD BE TO HARD TO EXPLAIN TO THE EUROPEANS WHY THE FRG WAS PROPOSING SOME OF THE LANGUAGE IN THOSE TWO PARAS. AS MISSION POINTED OUT IN PARA 5, REF C, IT WOULD BE BETTER FROM US VIEWPOINT FOR FRG TO PROPOSE THE TWO PARAS AS A COMPROMISE. HOWEVER, IF IT WOULD BE AWKWARD FOR FRG TO DO IT, THEN OBVIOUSLY THE US SHOULD INTRODUCE THE TEXTS WHEN APPROVED BILATERALLY. STREATROR

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptoning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 21 OCT 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: greeneet
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO05727
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197510101/abbrzmqz.tel
Line Count: 161
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) STATE 248364 180119Z OCT 75; B) BONN 17182 201920Z OCT 75 C) USNATO
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: greeneet
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 15 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <15 APR 2003 by SmithRJ>; APPROVED <17 SEP 2003 by greeneet>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: OPTION III: EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS: SPC MEETING OCTOBER 20
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006